



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,365	03/26/2007	Peter Liseck	4301-1161	6889
466	7590	12/29/2009		
YOUNG & THOMPSON	EXAMINER			
209 Madison Street	DEXTER, CLARK F			
Suite 500	ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, VA 22314	3724			
	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
	12/29/2009		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/578,365	Applicant(s) LISEC, PETER
	Examiner Clark F. Dexter	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 May 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
Paper No./Mail Date 12/14/09.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No./Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 8, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Publication 1 334 953 (hereafter EP '953) in view of Wark, pn 3,567,086 and/or Boardman, pn 3,592,370.

EP '953 discloses a device wherein almost every step of the claimed method is performed as described in detail in the previous Office action but lacks the step of exerting a localized second pressure as claimed exclusively in an area on the surface of the score line at only one end of the score line. However, the Examiner takes Official

notice that such a breaking configuration/step is old and well known in the art. That is, it is well known in the art that a progressive breaking action can be generated and often, based on the workpiece, only requires starting the break at one end of a score line. Such a step provides well known benefits including minimizing contact with the workpiece to prevent unwanted damage as well as providing a simpler breaking mechanism that can be relatively fixed in location. Wark (e.g., see Fig. 3) and Boardman (e.g., see Fig. 3) each discloses at least one of many known examples of such a pressure applying step/configuration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to exert a localized second pressure only at one end of the score line to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

Regarding claim 28, EP '953 discloses:

a linear motor (e.g., 8) configured to adjust the pressing tool in a normal direction perpendicular to the support surface.

In the alternative, if it is argued that EP '953 does not sufficiently disclose a linear motor, the Examiner takes Official notice that such linear motors are old and well known in the art and are well known equivalent devices that provide various well known benefits including different desirable maintenance benefits. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a linear motor on the device of EP '953 to gain the well known benefits as discussed above.

Regarding claims 26, 27, 29-31 and 33, EP '953 lacks the specific pressing tool structure as described in detail in the previous Office action. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that pressure-applying tools having such a configuration are old and

well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including a structure to efficiently and effectively apply pressure to a desired location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a tool having such a configuration on the device of EP '953 to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide pressure applying tools having such a configuration since applicant has not disclosed that having tools with such a configuration solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose, and it appears that the breaking device would perform equally well with virtually any one of the known pressure-applying tools.

It is noted that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement of the previous office action has been taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. See MPEP § 2144.03.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-

4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*/Clark F. Dexter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724*

cfd
December 22, 2009